

Appl. No. : 09/682,853  
Filed : October 24, 2001

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

In order to emphasize the patentable distinctions over the hypothetical combination of prior art, the claims are amended herein to obviate the interpretation. Specifically, the interpretation apparently contends that Steele shows using multiple different sources of information.

Steele's paragraphs 129-134 describes how a custom advertisement can be formed. Paragraph 110 describes that a plurality of service or product options are provided to an end user using things like location-based services, news updates and the like.

In order to obviate even further obviates the interpretation, however, claim 1 and other claims like claim 1 are amended to emphasize their patentable distinctions. Claim 1 recites that data is provided based on a request for information sent to a first server, and that the information is received from the request. Steele does not show his information received from a request – Steele's information is "pushed" to the cache that displays the information to a user.

Claim 1 defines that the information includes first results from querying a second source of information contained within a second Internet based webpage, and second results from querying a third source of information within a third Internet based webpage. Claim 1 also defines that the third Internet based

**Appl. No.** : **09/682,853**  
**Filed** : **October 24, 2001**

webpage is addressed using a different web address than is used to address the second Internet based webpage. This is supported by the original specification, for example block 200 in figure 2 shows going to eBay.com, block 300 shows going to Wells Fargo, and block 400 shows going to "site.com". Since each of these have different web addresses, this supports the newly-added limitation.

Brett, the primary reference, shows a ticket auctioning system. As part of this auctioning system, the user can get updated information, and that updated information can be reformatted. Brett describes how different participants may all access the same central computer through remote terminals, see for example column 5 beginning line 66 through column 6 lines 5. An auction is opened, and users can submit bids and receive results as part of that auction. Part of the function, for example described column 9, is to make sure that the seats that are provided are contiguous.

The rejection states that Brett teaches querying sources of information, referring to the databases 15, 16 and 17 and the internet webpages Figures 5-8. However, all of these databases / webpages are presumably within the same system. In order to obviate this interpretation, the claim 1 is amended, as described herein, to recite "where said third Internet based webpage is addressed using a different web address than is used to address said second Internet based webpage". This is not done by Brett, who never shows or suggests that a single request can be used to

**Appl. No.** : 09/682,853  
**Filed** : October 24, 2001

query first and second sources of information, and that these different sources of information have different web addresses as now claimed.

Moreover, this now-claimed feature produces an advantage that is not shown by Brett or Brett in view of Steele and Brandt – specifically that different information from multiple different internet sources can be separately queried from the single request. The information does not all have to be in one place as in Brett, but rather the query can bring together multiple different sources.

The secondary reference to Steele teaches a system where ads from different sources are “pushed” to an advertising pool.

Paragraph 108 of Steele describes his location based advertising business method. The system decides which advertisement to send to a user in response to a user update see paragraph 115. The advertisements which are sent to a user collectively form an “information pool”, see generally paragraphs 120-123. Some of the information in this user pool relates to the demographics of the individual, for example the demographic information described generally paragraphs 123-126.

Paragraphs 129 - 134 of Steele describe getting the ads for this information pool. Paragraph 130 describes that information from the vehicle can also be used, for example gas gauge information.

Appl. No. : 09/682,853  
Filed : October 24, 2001

Paragraph 131 describes that user's characteristics are compared against the database to determine whether the user fits an advertiser's desired characteristics and if so, sends ad information to the user.

Steele does obtain information from multiple sources of information. However, the information is received based on user characteristics, NOT BASED ON a request that receives first and second results as claimed. Therefore, while Steele does describe the user can get multiple different items of information, Neither of Steele or Brett show or otherwise suggest second and third Internet-based webpages that have different web addresses, and are addressed by "a request for information".

In fact, Steele does not use a request for information, but rather gets data pushed to the information pool based on a number of external inputs, see the unnumbered figure sheet 8 of 16, where all of the inputs are used to push data to the information pool, but those inputs do not include a query.

Brett does not call or otherwise access second and third Internet-based webpages that have different web addresses, and are addressed by "a request for information", as claimed.

Brandt does teach how variables can be passed between HTML pages. However, there is no disclosure in Brandt of the subject matter in claim 1, of

Appl. No. : 09/682,853  
Filed : October 24, 2001

addressing multiple Internet-based webpages using different web addresses. The HTML pages in Brandt appear to be all from the same Web server 222.

Therefore, to summarize the above, nothing in Brett in view of Steele in view of Brandt discloses or suggests querying multiple different sources of information based on a request for information as claimed, and defines the subject matter of claim 1.

Claims 2 and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being obvious over Rajan. This has been obviated by the amendment of claim 2 to recite that the first website is not related to the second website. The support for this feature is shown above. Rajan does not show this.

For example, Rajan's column 6 lines 12-17 state

"SW 51 executing on server 33 is provided, for the purpose of enabling a unique data-gathering and tunneling service that allows users operating such as appliances 39-43, and 47 15 to have structured access to data such as may be sourced in one of servers 21-25;" (emphasis added)

This is consistent with the other teaching of Rajan -- that one query gets information from one server.

Also, each of the queries in column 13 contemplate that a single query goes to a single internet server.

**Appl. No.** : **09/682,853**  
**Filed** : **October 24, 2001**

Rajan's columns 15-16 describe alerts, but again, this is one alert per request.

Rajan does not disclose or make obvious, as claimed, first and second websites, each different kind of request operative to request a different type of information, where a first request is a request for information from a first website and a second request is a request for different information from a second website different than said first website.

Therefore, claim 2 should be allowable thereover.

The dependent claims should be allowable for reasons stated above with respect to the respective independent claims.

Claim 9 has been amended to recite that the Internet websites have "a first domain name" and "a second domain name different than the first domain name". Nothing in the cited prior art discloses this.

Claim 17 defines that the plural Internet pages are opened on "plural different Internet servers". Nothing in the cited prior art discloses this subject matter. Certainly this is not disclosed in Brett in view of Steele, as shown above. Brandt discloses passing different variables two different to the Web server, but does not disclose that plural different Internet information is opened on plural different Internet pages, as claimed.

**Appl. No.** : **09/682,853**  
**Filed** : **October 24, 2001**

Claim 24 stands objected to based on an informality. Applicant believes that claim 24 is completely correct, but the numbering of the second "claim 24" from the preliminary amendment has been corrected in this response.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, claim 1 is amended herein for definiteness.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is hence respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that communications such as a telephone interview or email would facilitate disposal of this case, the undersigned respectfully encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail (using the email address [scott@harrises.com](mailto:scott@harrises.com)). I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Please charge any unpaid fees due in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 50-1387.

Appl. No. : 09/682,853  
Filed : October 24, 2001

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/11/09

/Scott C Harris/

Scott C. Harris

Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 23844  
Scott C. Harris, Esq.  
P.O. Box 927649  
San Diego, CA 92192  
Telephone: (619) 823-7778  
Facsimile: (858) 756-7717